

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the final Office Action mailed on October 4, 2007. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is submitted herewith. The Director is authorized to charge \$810 for the RCE and any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-1818. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 112857-61 on the account statement.

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. In response, Claims 1-26 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and new Claims 27-35 have been added. The amendment does not add new matter. In view of the amendment and/or for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 6-15 and 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,177,931 to Alexander et al. ("*Alexander*") in view of US Patent No. 6,553,178 to Abecassis ("*Abecassis*") and US Patent No. 6,263,503 to Margulis ("*Margulis*"). In the Office Action, Claims 5 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Alexander* in view of *Abecassis* and *Margulis* in further view of US Patent No. 5,561,708 to Remillard ("*Remillard*"). Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicants have canceled Claims 1-26 thereby rendering their rejections moot. New independent Claims 27 and 32 recite, in part, displaying, in response to the selection of the symbolic label, the data corresponding to the selected symbolic label in the first region and the television broadcast programs in place of the selected symbolic label in the second region. The amendment is supported in the specification, for example, at Figures 3A to 3E and at pages 25 to 26. An advantage of this display configuration and method is that it enables TV viewers to easily access information on a main broadcast program or the like. See, specification, pages 2, 33 and 34. For example, a TV viewer can obtain information displayed on the display device intuitively. In contrast, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references are deficient with respect to new independent Claims 27 and 32.

Alexander fails to disclose or suggest displaying the television broadcast programs in place of the selected symbolic label in the second region, as required, in part, by new

independent Claims 27 and 32. Instead, *Alexander* discloses first level information presented in designated panel and channel ad areas which, when highlighted, will cause additional text describing the product to be displayed in the detail box area of the display. See, *Alexander*, col. 13, lines 64-67 and col. 26, lines 4-18. Even when selected, the first level information remains in the channel ad area. See, *Alexander*, col. 21, lines 15-25 and Figures 10A and 10B. In other words, *Alexander* fails to disclose displaying, in response to the selection of the symbolic image, any data in place of the selected symbolic label in the second region.

Abecassis and *Margulis* fail to remedy the deficiencies of *Alexander*. Instead, the emphasis of *Abecassis* is drawn to a display device with a means to compensate the viewer for the verified apparent viewing of advertisements. See, *Abecassis*, col. 45, lines 1-9. Furthermore, the emphasis of *Margulis* is drawn to a method for supporting data transmissions on various program sources. See, *Margulis*, col. 4, lines 44-55. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that, even if combinable, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest every element of the present claims. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that new independent Claims 27 and 32 and their dependent claims are novel, nonobvious and distinguishable from the cited references.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified patent application and earnestly solicit an early allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Customer No. 29175

Dated: October 25, 2007